



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,372	02/18/2004	Miska Hannuksela	915-005.043-1	3558

4955 7590 11/19/2010  
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP  
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5  
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224  
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER
----------

ANYIKIRE, CHIKAODILI E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2482

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/19/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/782,372	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HANNUKSELA, MISKA	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2482	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-25 and 27-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-25 and 27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This application is responsive to application number (10782372) filed on February 18, 2004. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-25, and 27-29 are pending and have been examined.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed September 13, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments are in response to the Remarks of September 13, 2010.

The applicant argues that Yasuda does not teach "arranging encoded pictures in decoding order and that each picture of the at least one video sequence has a distinct video sequence identification separate from the picture identification associated to the picture" (page 2 lines 18 – 21). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Yasuda disclosing the GOP responds to the video sequence of the present invention. The arranging of the encoding pictures in a decoder order and this case correlates the display order information disclosed by Yasuda and coherent with MPEG and image coding standards.

The applicant argues that "no video sequence identification is not taught" (page 3 lines 3-6). The applicant further argues that the GOP number is temporary. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the assertion that because the GOP number is temporary it can not indicate the video sequence identification. The claim does not require the identification of the video sequence to be permanent only that indicates the arrangement of the encoded pictures.

The examiner hopes the explanation of above explains the broadness of the claims as currently written. Further, the claim language has been updated.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-16, 20-25, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yasuda et al (US 6, 754, 275).

As per **claim 1**, Yasuda disclose a method of ordering encoded pictures, the method comprising:

forming encoded pictures in an encoder, wherein at least one video sequence is formed (Figs 1(a)-(c); column 6 lines 19 – 24)),

defining a picture identification for each picture of the group of pictures (column 9 lines 53 – 56; Yasuda discloses detecting a frame number which would represent the picture identification),

transmitting said encoded pictures to a decoder (column 8 lines 18-19), and  
arranging the encoded pictures in decoder order (column 8 lines 31-40),  
wherein each picture of the at least one video sequence has a distinct video  
sequence identification separate from the picture identification associated to the  
pictures (column 9 lines 53-56),

wherein the video sequence identification has the same value for each picture of  
the same video sequence (Fig 1(a)-(c), GOP (n); column 9 lines 53-56), and

wherein the video sequence identification is arranged to be used for determining  
which pictures belong to the same video sequence (column 9 lines 44-56).

As per **claim 3**, Yasuda disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein two or  
more sequence of pictures are formed, and different video sequence identification are  
defined for said two or more sequences of pictures (Fig 1(a) – (c); column 9 lines 23-  
38).

As per **claim 4**, Yasuda disclose the method according to claim 3, wherein the  
decoding order of the pictures is determined according to the video sequence  
identification (column 8 lines 18-40).

As per **claim 5**, Yasuda disclose the method according to claim 3, wherein the  
video sequence identification are transmitted on a video layer, and the picture  
identification are transmitted a on video layer (column 8 lines 18-40).

Regarding **claim 6**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are  
applicable to claim 6.

As per **claim 7**, Yasuda disclose the method according to claim 6, wherein one picture of video sequence is an independently decodable picture (column 6 lines 58-62) for which said identification sequence identifications defined, at least one sub-sequence is formed of the pictures of the group of pictures, and that each picture of the sub-sequence has the same value of the video sequence identification sequence identification as the independently decodable picture of the same group of pictures (Fig 1(a)-(c); column 6 lines 9 -23 and column 7 lines 18-28).

Regarding **claim 8**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable to claim 8.

Regarding **claim 9**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable to claim 9.

Regarding **claim 10**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable to claim 10.

As per **claim 12**, Yasuda disclose a method for ordering encoded pictures comprising a first and a second encoded picture, comprising:

forming at least a first transmission unit is formed on the basis of the first encoded picture (Fig 1(a)-(c); column 7 lines 3-17),

forming at least a second transmission unit is formed on the basis of the second encoded picture (Fig 1(a)-(c); column 7 lines 3-17),

wherein a first identification sequence identification is defined in said first transmission unit and a second sequence identification is defined in said second transmission unit, wherein the first identification sequence identification has the same

value as the second video sequence identification sequence identification when the first and the second encoded picture belong to a same group of pictures (column 6 lines 4-22), and

wherein a first identifier is defined for said first transmission unit and a second identifier is defined for said second transmission unit, the first and second identifiers being indicative of the respective decoding order of information included in the first transmission unit and information included in the second transmission unit (Fig 1(a)-(c); column 6 lines 4-22).

As per **claim 13**, Yasuda discloses the method according to claim 12, wherein the identifier is defined as an integer number (Fig 1(a)-(c); column 6 lines 4-57).

As per **claim 14**, Yasuda disclose the method according to claim 13, wherein a larger integer number with wrap around indicates a later decoding order (column 6 lines 9-22).

As per **claim 15**, Yasuda disclose the method according to claim 12, wherein said first transmission unit includes a first slice and said second transmission unit includes a second slice (Fig 1(a)-(c); column 6 lines 9-22).

Regarding **claim 16**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12 are applicable to claim 16.

Regarding **claim 20**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12 are applicable to claim 20.

Regarding **claim 21**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 15 are applicable to claim 21.

Regarding **claim 22**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12 are applicable to claim 22.

Regarding **claim 23**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12 are applicable to claim 23.

Regarding **claim 24**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12 are applicable to claim 24.

Regarding **claim 25**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12 are applicable to claim 25.

Regarding **claim 27**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12 are applicable to claim 27.

Regarding **claim 28**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12 are applicable to claim 28.

Regarding **claim 29**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 15 are applicable to claim 29.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.



6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuda (US 6, 754, 275) in view of Bigham et al (US 5, 677, 905).

As per **claim 17**, Yasuda discloses the device according to claim 16, wherein it is a communication system (column 1 lines 15 – 24).

However, Yasuda does not explicitly teach a gateway device.

In the same field of endeavor, Bigham et al disclose wherein it is a gateway device (Col 4 Ln 38-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify image coding apparatus of Yasuda with the gateway device of Bigham et al because it will support a wide range of signaling protocols to control the disparate functions of all the components necessary to set up each session connection through the network.

As per **claim 19**, Yasuda discloses the device according to claim 16, wherein it is a communication system (column 1 lines 15 – 24).

However, Yasuda does not explicitly teach a streaming server.

In the same field of endeavor, Bigham et al teaches wherein it is a streaming server (Col 9 Ln 10-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify image coding apparatus of Yasuda with the streaming server of Bigham et al because it will provide the capability of transmitting multimedia interactively.

8. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuda (US 6, 754, 275) in view of Watkins (US 2004/0039796).

As per **claim 18**, Yasuda discloses the device according to claim 16, wherein it is a communication device (column 1 lines 15 – 24).

However, Yasuda does not explicitly teach a mobile communication device.

In the same field of endeavor, Watkins et al teaches wherein it is a mobile communication device ([0018]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify image coding apparatus of Yasuda with the mobile communication device of Watkins because it will provide the capability carry and operate the device in different locations.

***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE whose telephone number is (571)270-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 am to 5 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272 - 7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2482

/Chikaodili E Anyikire/  
Patent Examiner AU 2482